

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 8 and 9 will be amended, whereby claims 1, 2 and 7-9 will remain pending.

Applicants express appreciation for the indication of allowance of claims 1, 2 and 7, and respectfully request allowance of each of the pending claims upon reconsideration of this application.

Discussion of December 8, 2004 Telephone Interview.

Applicants express appreciation for the courtesies extended by the Examiner during a December 8, 2004 telephone interview with Applicants' representatives.

During the interview, the parentage of the application was discussed, and the Examiner indicated that amendment of the specification in the manner presented herein would remove the objection to the parentage.

The rejections of Claims 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and the amendments presented herein were discussed with the Examiner. The Examiner indicated that he would consider the amendments as presented herein when submitted in writing.

Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

In response and as discussed with the Examiner during the above-noted interview, claim 9 has been amended to delete under hydrous conditions. The Examiner indicated that this

amendment would remove this ground of rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraphs 1 and 2.

Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraphs 1 and 2, as the claimed invention is not described, or is not described in such full, clear, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the same, and/or failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as his invention.

In response and as discussed with the Examiner during the above-noted interview, the claims have been amended herein in the manner discussed during the telephone interview with the Examiner in accordance with the originally filed disclosure. In particular, it is noted that “oxypropyl” is disclosed in the compounds and processes of producing the compounds throughout the originally filed disclosure. Applicants submit that one of skill in the art reading the specification in its entirety would have understood that the claims as amended is directed to the subject matter disclosed in Applicants’ originally filed application.

For example, the Examiner’s attention is directed to the last paragraph on page 9 and Applicants’ Examples.

In view of the above, this ground of rejection should be withdrawn.

Response To Objection To Abstract

The abstract has been objected to as being drawn to a single compound and not subject to the present claims.

In response, Applicants respectfully submit that an appropriate Abstract was submitted with the Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. 1.111, filed September 2, 2004. Applicants therefore respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection and rejections of record, and allow each of the pending claims.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that an early indication of allowance of the application be indicated by the mailing of the Notices of Allowance and Allowability.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Kouichi SEKHYA et al.


Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

Agm 33.098

December 9, 2004
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191